**CUSTOMER NO.: 24498**
**Serial No.: 10/591,556**
**Date of Office Action: 02/04/09**
**Response dated: 04/27/09**

**PATENT**
**PU030221**

**Remarks/Arguments**

Applicants have carefully reviewed the application in light of the Office Action dated February 4, 2009. To better point out anad claim their invention, Applicants have amended claims 28 and 29. Following this amendment, claims 1-29 remain in this application. Applicants have added no new matter. Kindly reconsider the rejections in view of the claim amendments and the accompanying remarks.

**35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection of Claim 28**

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner asserts that claim 28 (and presumably claim 29 as well) represent software per se and thus fall outside the bounds of patentable subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 28 and 29 to recite a computer-readable storage medium comprising a unique program. Thus, claims 28 and 29 now appear in a format deemed patentable by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. See *In re Beauregard,* 53 F.3d 1583, (1995). Further, Applicants direct the examiner's attention to MPEP § 2106.01 which states:

> "When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized."

Therefore, Applicants' claims 28 and 29 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. §101.

Further, Applicants assert that claims 28 and 29 possess ample antecedent basis in Applicants' specification. Applicants' specification describes programming in the local computer. Those skilled in the art would recognize that there must exist some form of computer readable storage medium to store such programming. Using techniques for storing computer programs onto computer readable media well known in the art, a skilled artisan could easily implement the inventions described in claims 28 and 29 based on Applicants' specification. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 28 and 29, as amended, comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

**35 U.S.C. 103(a) of Claims 1–9, 11, 13, and 15–29**

Claims 1–9, 11, 13, and 15–29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0055951 to Slotznick (hereinafter "Slotznick") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,947,992 to Shachor (hereinafter "Shachor").

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "packing information comprising the message of the session and the resource locator; sending the packed information to a remote site computer from the local computer." Independent claims 22, 25, 26, and 28 recite analogous language. The Examiner concedes that Slotznick does not disclose cookies (and hence does not disclose packing or sending session messages to a remote site computer), but asserts that Shachor cures this deficiency.

Shachor describes a technique for maintaining a connection between a single client computer and a plurality of servers. After the client receives session information from the server, the client can maintain that session even if the particular server changes. However, nowhere does Shachor discuss packaging such a session message, or transferring the message from the client. Once Shachor's client has received the session message, no further transfer of that message occurs.

In contrast, Applicants' claimed invention recites packaging a session message with a resource locator and sending them to a remote site computer. Applicants' claimed invention thus cn can effectively transfer the session to the remote site computer and allow it to communicate with the server as if the remose site computer were the local computer. Thus, Applicants' invention affords significant a advantage over the prior art by allowing transfer of an authenticated session to permit a user to conduct remotc site downloading of content to which the user has privileged access. Because Shachor concerns itself with a single client machine maintaining a session between multiple servers, this reference has no need to ever package or transfer that session information.

Applicants respectfully assert that Slotznick and Shachor, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest packaging a cookie with a resource locator, and furthermore fail to disclose or suggest sending such packaged information to a remote site computer from the local computer. Therefore, independent claims 1, 22, 25, 26, and 28 patentably distinguish over the art of record, claims 2–9, 11, 13, 15–21, 23–24, 27, and 29

depend from claims 1, 22, 26, and 28 and incorporate by reference all of the features of their respective parent claims. Thus, claims 2–9, 11, 13, 15–21, 23–24, 27, and 29 patentably distinguish over the art of record for the same reason as claims 1, 22, 26, and 28.

In addition, several dependant claims include subject matter which patentably distinguishes such claims over the art of record for reasons beyond those discussed above. For instance, claim 3 recites, "wherein the RSD program is a plug-in in a web browser." Claims 18, 23, 25, and 27–29 recite analogous language. In rejecting such claims, the Examiner asserts that Slotznick teaches such a plug-in in connection with the use of a TV Phone to surf the Internet. However, Slotznick nowhere discloses or suggests a plug-in, whether used for remote site downloading or for any other purpose. The ability to surf the internet in no way implies the use of plug-ins, as such software components, to provide additional functionality on top of the HTML standard. As a result, surfing the Internet can occur without the use of any plug-ins.

Shachor does not cure the deficiencies of Slotznick in this respect. Shachor simply discusses a technique for having a client computer maintain a session across multiple servers using cookies. This functionality requires no plug-ins, and indeed, Shacor neither discloses or suggests plug-ins.

Applicants respectfully assert that Slotznick and Shachor, taken alone or in any combination, fail to disclose or suggest an RSD program which constitutes a plug-in to a web browser. Therefore, claims 3, 18, 23, 25, and 27–29 recite patentable subject matter beyond that recited in claims 1, 22, and 26.

**35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1, 10 and 12**

Claims 1, 10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,377,974 to Feigenbaum (hereinafter "Feigenbaum") in view of Shachor.

As noted above, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "packing information comprising the message of the session and the resource locator; sending the packed information to a remote site computer from the local computer." The Examiner concedes that Feigenbaum does not disclose this element, but again cites Shachor as provide the teaching missing in Feigenbaum.

For at least the same reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully assert that Feigenbaum and/or Shachor, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. Claims 10 and 12 depend from claim 1 and include all of the elements of their parent claim. Therefore, Applicants maintain that claims 10 and 12 patentably distinguish over the art of record for the same reasonson as claim 1.

**35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection of Claim 14**

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feigenbaum in view of Shachor and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,959,285 to Stefanik et al. (hereinafter "Stefanik").

Stefanik does not cure the deficiencies of Feigenbaum and Shachor described above with respect to claim 1. Since claim 14 depends from claim 1 and incorporates by reference all of the features therefor, claim 14 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Feigenbaum, Shachor, and/or Stefanik.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants solicit entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner cannot take such action, the Examiner should contact the Applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6820 to arrange a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview.

No fees are believed due with regard to this Amendment. However, if there is a fee, please charge the fee and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **07-0832.**

Respectfully submitted,
JUN LI ET AL.

By: _____
Robert B. Levy, Attorney
Reg. No. 28,234
Phone (609) 734-6820

RBL:pdf

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

April 27, 2009